IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE

AT - BILASPUR

W.P.NO. 139 /2000

BETWEEN

(3)

PETITIONER : DINESH KUMAR BELCHANDAN
AGE - 40 YEARS
SON OF SHRI H.L.BELCHANDAN
POSTED AS - LECTURER
AT- GOVT. GIRL'S HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL, BHILAI-3
DISTRICT - DURG(C.G.)
R/O- H-2/48 VTH BUILDING
DURG (CHHATTISGARH)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :

1. STATE OF CHHATTISGARH
THROUGH THE SECRETARY
MINISTRY OF SCHOOL EDUCATION
D.K.BHAWAN, RAIPUR
2. DISTRICT EDUCATION OFFICER
DURG (CHHATTISGARH)
3. THE PRINCIPAL,
GOVT. GIRL'S HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL, BHILAI-3 DIST. -DURG
4. M.P.STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, BENCH AT- RAIPUR
THROUGH THE REGISTRAR

PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA.

XI-1
HC-22

(26)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P. No. 139/2000 सन् 200

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	15/2/2001 Shri R.S. Patel, learned counsel for the petitioner. Shri Gautam Bhadhuri, learned PL for State. Heard. The petitioner being aggrieved by the order (Annexure P/1) requiring the Principal of the school to draw the salary of the applicant from one particular school, filed the petition before the State Administrative Tribunal. The Tribunal after hearing the parties found that there was no allegation of the petitioner that salary was not paid to him and therefore dismissed the petition. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in Annexure P/8 in almost a similar petition the Tribunal has interfered, therefore, there wa-s no reason for the Tribunal to dismiss the petition. We have gone through P/8, the said order. The argument in this said petition was that the order of drawing/withdrawal of the salary from another school was motivated and was a step in aid to declare the said petition as surplus. In the present case there are no allegations as such. It is not in dispute before us that the petitioner is getting his salary regularly.	

..2

[पीछे देखिये

आदेश पत्रक (पुर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, we are unable to hold that the petitioner is making out a case for interference by the High Court under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

The petition is dismissed.

Sd/-
Chief Justice

Sd/-
R.S. Sharma
Judge

GRPRJ—FS/311—1/2001—50,000.